



3 1761 07983646 6

Eitrem, Samson
Observations on the Colax
of Menander

PA
4247
E57

OBSERVATIONS
ON THE COLAX OF MENANDER AND
THE EUNUCH OF TERENCE

BY

S. EITREM.

(VIDENSKABS-SELSKABETS SKRIFTER. II. HIST.-FILOS. KLASSE. 1906. No. 7).

UDGIVET FOR H. A. BENNECHES FOND.

CHRISTIANIA.

IN COMMISSION BY JACOB DYBWAD.

PRINTED BY A. W. BRØGGER.

1906.

LaG1
IV

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE COLAX OF MENANDER AND THE EUNUCH OF TERENCE

BY

S. EITREM.

(VIDENSKABS-SELSKABETS SKRIFTER. II. HIST.-FILOS. KLASSE. 1906. No. 7).

UDGIVET FOR H. A. BENNECHES FOND.

CHRISTIANIA.

IN COMMISSION BY JACOB DYBWAD.

PRINTED BY A. W. BRØGGER.

1906.

267645
13. 5. 32



PA
4247
E67



Fremlagt i Mødet den 23de Marts 1906.

Observations on the Colax of Menander and the Eunuch of Terence.

By

S. Eitrem.

To Professor P. O. Schjøtt.

In the third volume of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri the editors have published the considerable fragment now well known of Menander's Colax (No. 409). Mssrs. Grenfell and Hunt in restoring and supplying the hundred verses have been helped by the master-hand of Prof. Blass (cp. his review in Archiv für Papyrusforschung III, p. 277—8). Moreover Prof. Leo has published a very important article (Göttinger Nachrichten, 1903, p. 673—92) with an ingenious reconstruction of the scenes in question. He appeals for further inquiry into these noble remains of a Menandrian drama, and in fact, much is still obscure and puzzling in these badly damaged remains of the Colax, as regards single words as well as sense. It is safe to start with the best preserved part of

Col. II

containing the description of the **parasite**.

L. 42. οὐθὲς ἐπλούτησεν ταχέως δίκαιος ὢν
ὁ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ συλλέγει καὶ φείδεται,
ὁ δὲ τὸν πάλαι τηροῦντ' ἐνεδρεύσας πάντ' ἔχει.

The speaker of the lines proves the assertion that the person in question¹ has rapidly grown rich through *ἀδικία*: wealth suddenly ac-

¹ Already Grauert Analekten p. 165 has referred the passage (= Stob. Flor. X 21) to Struthias.

quired sufficiently proves a dishonest character. The word *injustice* has particular emphasis in the whole argument (l. 45 ὥς ἀδικ[ον] εἶπες, l. 53 τὸ ἀδικεῖν at the end of the verse, l. 42 δίκαιος ὢν). This seems to be a very solemn speech considering the frivolous nature of the parasite Struthias, who utilizes the weak points in the soldier's character. To understand the expressions, we have to recur to the historical development of the parasite on the Athenian stage and in Greek literature on the whole, such as O. Ribbeck has tried to explain it in his ethological study on the Colax (Abh. der säch. Ges. d. Wiss. 1883, No. 1). According to his view (pp. 21, 26) Menander has treated the rather trite figure of the flatterer in a new, interesting way, especially by attaching him as a companion to the soldier; Greek life from Alexander's time had once more since the Peloponnesian war brought this type of man so scorned to the surface, now more polished and refined, particularly when contrasted with the stupid upstart from the battlefields, the object of his εἰρωνεία. This combination may to a great extent have brought about the great success of the Menandrian Colax, but the figure itself preserved of course the general characteristic outlines that always made it a favourite with the Athenian public.

The literary treatment of the Colax (or, if his want of food is stressed, the »Parasite«) may in some respects be traced back to the Homeric description of the Ithacian beggar, Iros. This nick-name had been given to him by the νέοι, with whom he principally had to do, cf. Antiphanes fr. 195 K. καλοῦσι μ' οἱ νεώτεροι σκηπτόν, Ergasilus in Plaut. Capt. 68 (juventus nomen indidit scorto mihi / eo quia invocatus soleo esse in convivio) and Peniculus in Menæchmi 77 (juventus nomen fecit Peniculo mihi). In fact, the ignominious social position of the flatterer is due to his actual identity with the beggar (Plaut. egens parasitus; Capt. 470 ridiculos inopesque). In the 18. song of the Odyssey Iros is introduced as πτωχὸς πανδῆμιος, whose principal feature is the γαστριμαργία (l. 2 ἔπρεπε γαστέρι μάρρη ἄζηχες φαγέμεν καὶ πέμεν, l. 114 ἄναλτος). The same craving for meat is indicated by the name Ἀρναῖος (perhaps Aristoph. Vesp. 1281 of Cleonymos may be compared ἐρέπτεται τὰ τῶν ἐχόντων ἀνέρων). His outward appearance is not at all bad, εἶδος δὲ μάλα μέγας ἦν ὁράσθαι, his limbs quiver from fatness, he is not an old man (l. 31, cf. Ribbeck p. 41). His function as a messenger is the overture of the ἐθελοδοῦλεία of the parasites, and although he infests the whole Demos, yet his favourite place is the court, where he holds the office of beggar to the royal household without rivals. If rivals should appear, he scolds them

as *μολοβροί* (i. e. *παράσιτος*, Hes.), and now develops into a real *ἀλαζών* (*βουγάις* l. 79). What Odysseus as a beggar most complains of is the *γαστήρ κακοεργός*, which is the very keynote of parasitic lamentations at all times, from Archilochus and Asios down to Lucian and Alciphron. The prize of the *ἀγών*, in accordance with this, is a stomach filled with fat and blood. The fighting match of Iros and Odysseus resembles in some respects the flattering scene between the Paphlagonian and the Sausagedealer in the *Equites* of Aristophanes, cp. the entertainment in Alciphron III 43,2 and the apprehension of the parasite in Plaut. *Stich.* 388 sqq. The scene in the *Odyssey* terminates in the ignominious expulsion of Iros: *ἔλκεται θύραζε*, cp. *infra*.

It is well known that Greek scholars, such as Demetrius of Scepsis, traced the history of the flatterer back to Homeric times (Ribbeck l. c. p. 7, Athen. 236 d). That they have commented on this scene in the *Odyssey* from this point of view is proved by the commentary of Eustathius. They may have adduced many expressions and parallels from comedies in which a flatterer has played a part, besides direct quotations such as Timocles fr. 44,3 and *ὁ πλεῖστα πίνων πλεῖστα κενύραν-θῆσεται* (1835, 20 = Athen. 129 e)¹. The »paraphrastes Demosthenes« describes Iros as *κακόν τι πάνδημον οἷος ἐσθίων ῥαγῆναι δι' ἡμέρας· καὶ πολὺν ἄκρατον πιεῖν· καὶ ἦν αὐτὸ τοῦτο γαστήρ μόνον καὶ σχῆμα τηνάλλως*² (cp. Menander [?] fr. 1086 K.); 1834, 10 *ἀντιλαμβάνοι δ' ἂν ὁ Ἴρος ψωμὶν ῥαπίσματος κρέας τε κονδύλου καὶ οἶνον ἀγ-γελίας τῆς ὅπου δήποτε*. In 1836, 60 we read a story of Anacharsis and the *γελωτοποιοί* as lamentable *πιθηκοί*; 1837, 20 a *παρατήρησις παλαιὰ σκώπτουσα ῥητορικώτερον τὸν Ὀδυσσεά* as *λαίμαργος*; [then a story of the King's friend among the Persians (*χαμαὶ καθήμενος καὶ κυνιστὶ σιτούμενος τὸ παρατεθέν*). Then he discusses at length Odysseus as a slave to the stomach (that of his own or the prize stomach of the contest): *ὁρθῶς ἂν γάστρις λέγοιτο παρὰ το γαστρίσαι, ὃ δηλοῖ μὲν καὶ τὸ χορτάσαι, σημαίνει δέ, φασι, καὶ τὸ εἰς γαστέρα πλῆξαι. Καὶ ὅτι, ὥσπερ ἀπλήστου σκῶμμα ὁ γάστρις, οὕτω καὶ ὁ γαστρίμαργος καὶ ὁ γαστε-ρόπληξ καὶ ὁ παντόφαρυγξ καὶ ὁ τραπεζεὺς καὶ ὁ τραπεζολοιχὸς καὶ ὁ κνισσολοιχὸς καὶ ὁ ἐνθεσίδουλος ἦτοι ψωμόδουλος· ἐνθεσις γάρ,*

¹ Later he quotes Alexis, as he formerly cited Menander (l. 49 sq. of our present fragment). The sepulchre of Darius perhaps had the following inscription: *ἡδυνάμην πολὺν | οἶνον τε πίνειν καὶ φέρειν τοῦτον καλῶς*. A little before we may read, with a slight alteration, *τὸ μὲν φαγεῖν ἀζηγῆς οὐ πολλοὺς πᾶνν, | πιεῖν δ' ἀζηγῆς μυρίους ἀπώλεσεν*.

² venter Lucil 75 Marx.

φασιν, ὁ ψωμός· καὶ ὁ τένθης ὡς λίχνος· τένθη γάρ φασιν ἢ λιχνεία· καὶ ὁ θυράπαξ¹ κατὰ δὲ Ἰππώνακτα καὶ ὁ μεσσηγυδορποχέστης, ἥγουν ὃς μεσοῦντος δείπνου πολλάκις ἀποπατεῖ ὡς πάλιν ἐμπίπlassθαι. Here we have a store of terms which may supply Ribbeck's list of synonyms p. 93—100².

According to Ribbeck the word κόλαξ was introduced not long before Aristophanes, and the theatrical type was first presented to the Athenian public, sharply defined with all its drastic characteristics, by Eupolis in his drama the *Κόλακες* 421. Here the δεινὰ θηρία of which the chorus consisted may have been giants ending in big κόλα, intestines. But even before this drama the Athenians must have been as familiar with the type as with the word, otherwise they would not have fully appreciated the part of the consummate flatterer that Cleon repeatedly played in the dramas of Aristophanes. That Athenian dramatists eagerly studied the Sicilian Epicharm, not only to derive philosophical sentences from him, cannot be doubted³, and as for the παράσιτος he has presented him as a novelty (τὸν ῥαυδίως λαψῆι τυ κατ το νῦν γὰ θην | εὔωνον ἀείσιτον as Kaibel corrects fr. 34) to the public of Syracuse with much the same outlines as Eupolis later in Athens gave to his κόλαξ. According to von Salis (p. 48) Crates in his *Γείτονες* was the first to show the Athenians the poor flatterer from the stage, returning from the banquet, intoxicated and lamenting his utter indigence, that did not allow him to have [either a boy or] a torch on his way home (fr. 3 K., cp. Epich. fr. 35, l. 8 Kaib.). Even if the argument is rather weak⁴, an analysis of the Aristophanic Cleon will at any rate prove the type to have been quite popular in the Athenian theatre before Aristophanes. It is this intimate relation of the demagogue to the state that makes this disgrace of private life an ignominy when transferred to the state.

¹ Θυροπάταξ? Cf. Plaut. Bacch. 582, Stich. 326, Capt. 832 pultare assulatim fores, Men. 176, Lucil. fr. 843 Marx: caede ostium, Gnato, urge.

² Iros has become the common name of a beggar, 1834, 20: Ἴροι πάντες οἱ ἐπαιτούντες. Ῥωποκάπηλος I add from Donatus Ter. Eun. 253 Wessn. Gnato Lucilius 843 and 845 Marx probably is the parasite of the miles. Moreover I cite from Lucilius ed. Marx 75 vivite lurcones, comedones, vivite ventres, cp. 171 qui edit se hic comedit me. Catillo? s. Macrob. Saturn. III 16, 17.

³ Cp. lately A. von Salis: De Doriensium ludorum in com. Attica vestigiis (diss. Basel, 05) p. 55 sqq.; Wilamowitz Die gr. Literatur p. 53.

⁴ Fr. 39 K. is no good support for taking the »neighbours« for the parasites; the Epicharmean parasite does not live next door to his rich entertainer, 35, 9 sqq. as he does Plaut. Stich. 400, 454.

As early as in the parabase of the Acharnians the poet had spoken of those that beguile the state *θωπεύοντες*, and in the Equites the Athenians had no difficulty in recognizing Cleon as a splendid specimen of a well known type that had already been stigmatized by the name *κόλαξ*. We have here a store of attributes that always remained characteristic of the flatterer: *πονηρός*, *ἀναιδής*, *ἐπίορκος*¹, *κλέπτης*, (cp. 745); with fellow flatterers *διάβολος*, *φθονερός* (cp. 821 sq.); *βωμολόχος*, *ἀλαζών*; of low extraction and, consequently, badly educated (181, 334)²; to *τάλλότρια δειπνεῖν* there is an allusion in v. 299; cp. *τάλλότριον ἁμῶν θέρους* 392 (1295)³; a bee 404, cp. *βλίττειν* 794, 259; *φάραγξ καὶ χάρυβδις ἄρπαγῆς* 248 (with Blaydes' note; Cratin. fr. 397 *γαστροχάρυβδις*; cp. fr. 44 *βδελλολάρυγξ* Eub. fr. inc. 134 *λάρυγξ*); *κόβαλος*, *πίθηκος*, *θώψ*, *ἐραστής*⁴; always on the outlook for prey (263, 313, 864), *αἶετος*, *λάρος*, *ἰέραξ*; a *κύων* that always wags his tail (*αἰκάλλειν*, *σαίνειν*), *κυναλώπηξ*, *δράκων αἵματοπότης*⁵. All his thoughts are concentrated on the the table and the stomach, e. g. 280, 1128 *τρέφειν* . . . *ὅταν ἡ πλέως*, 1136; *ῥέγχει μεθύων ἔπιτιος* 104⁶. His currish nature is shown v. 1031: *κέρχω σαίνων σ' ὅπῳταν δειπνῇς ἐπιτηρῶν*. The comparison to kitchen-utensils necessary to every household, *δοίδυξ* and *τορένη*, originates in the same conception of this slave of the belly, to whom the *τρέφων* is the *δεσπότης* 960⁷, and who has worthy parallels in Cleonymus and the *ἀνέστιος* and *πένης* parasite 1266. In harmony with this Cleon's pious wish is that the sausage-dealer, *τὸ γεννικιώτατον (δεξιιώτατον) κρέας*, may perish in the same way as he lives, viz. through voracity. It is quite natural that his enemies, directed by the trained eye of his counterpart, should aim at the weakest point of their antagonist, the belly—probably the most prominent part of his outward appearance as of that of his opponent: *γάστριζε καὶ τοῖς ἐντέροις καὶ τοῖς κόλοις χύπῳς κολᾷ τὸν ἄνδρα*⁸, a blow that the dramatist Nicolaus in later times has repeated aiming at the stomach of

¹ Cp. Stich, 230 *perierationes parasiticæ*.

² Asios: *ἡ ρως εἰσὶ τῇ βροβόρῳ ἐξ ἀναδύς*. As for the name *Βορβορόζωμος* Alc. III 74 it is explained by this epigram: *ἦλθεν . . . ζῶμοῦ περιμήνους . . . β. τ.*

³ cp. 1258 *ἐν τάγορᾳ γὰρ κοιτόμενος ἐβουκόμην*: he has been thinking of *βόσκειν τὴν γαστέρα* *parasitando pascere ventrem* (Pl. Persa 56), cp. supra.

⁴ As to the parasite as «amator» see Plaut. Stich. 583 sq.

⁵ Even his impudent way of looking at people is characteristic of the *κόλαξ*, cp. Luc. de paras. 864: *δεινὸν βλέπων ὅποιον ἔμελλε, μέγα καὶ ὑψαίμων*. Pollux Onomast. IV, 148 *ὁ κόλαξ ἀνατίθεται κακοηθιτέρεως τὸς ὄφρως*.

⁶ Cf. Epicha m fr. 35, 13 sqq.

⁷ *ο τιγματὶς κτισσοκόλαξ* already Asios.

⁸ Cp. v. 273, Nub. 549 and *κολετράω* ib.; Lucilius 1071 Marx.

the first parasite Tantalus (III p. 323 Kock)¹. Why should not Aristophanes have alluded to Cleon as a real κόλαξ, punning on his intimate connection with κόλον τροφή and κοίλια as the authority of Athenæus 262 a actually explained the etymology of the word? The technical word κολακείειν he has himself used l. 48². The same inclination for the same weak point is indicated by the wish μή ποτ' ἀγοραίου Διὸς σπλέγχουσι παραγνοίμην (as βομολόχος) Ἀγοραῖοι, 15 ἄγορᾶς are both Cleon and his rival, and it seems probable, considering the double or triple meaning of the word in this connection, that the marketplace in Athens even then was the very centre of the business operations of the flatterers and the feeding place of other ἀγοραῖοι (1257), as it was the hunting ground of the Eupolidean flatterer a few years later (fr. 159 l. 7 K.)³. Here too he is observed by the young man when Menander writes more than a hundred years later.

After all, it seems to be evident that the social position of this type of man so universally scorned was quite fixed and literarily worked out in Athens at the time of the Equites, and it is at least very probable that the Epicharmean parasite was the direct prototype of the Athenian κόλαξ. In Athens τὸ παρασιτεῖν always remained the aim and end of τὸ κολακείειν. The spectators are very likely to have fully appreciated the pitch of the evolution of the drama, when the two knaves, whose τεχνήματα make up the new τέχνη (1407) and who scold one another with technical terms of the cooking art, work themselves up to be themselves the real τρέφοντες (τιτθαί l. 716) of their δεσπότης. The whole action terminates in the bearing off of Cleon (ἥρως Asios), ἐκφέρεται θύραζε l. 1407 as Eupolis later styled it, leaving it to his rival to take the office of θεράπων⁴ to the People. Aristophanes, as it seems, was the first among the dramatists to transfer the type to the demagogues, stamping them as κόλακες, and here he made an epoch.

¹ From the same reason the parasite Podes (P 575), according to Demetrius of Scepsis, is hurt in the stomach, Athen. VI 236 d. Already Epicharm represented his flatterer as afraid of injuries fr. 35, 12.

² L. 814 we might perhaps correct μεστίν to νήστην = νῆστιν, intestinum jejunum (Kühner-Blass I p. 546).

³ of the sycophants Diphil. Emp. fr. 32 K. l. 16, Plaut. Trin. 815, Capt. 491. In Lucian de par. 51 the parasite avoids the marketplace and the δικαστήρια that he leaves to the sycophants in preference to the gymnasiums and the symposia.

⁴ Ribbeck p. 64.

The next time he represents Cleon, he gives him the mask of a dog, to whom the kitchen is the world¹, Vesp. 904 ἀγαθὸς γ' ὑλακτεῖν καὶ διαλείχειν τὰς χύτρας (cp. Eq. 1034; Eupol. fr. 52). Cleon persecutes Laches² because he μόνος κατήσθιεν what he had stolen: the ἀνὴρ μονοφαιστότατος is the worst of all (cp. Ribbeck p. 100 and the name Μονόγναθος Alc. f. 1). Cleon is οἰκουρὸς μόνον, he is still καρχαρόδους (1031, cp. Eq. 1017) — the predecessor of Karcharos-Thrason Athen. VI p. 251 e — and has the impudent look of a Κύν-νη. As long as the old Athenian was his friend, he tried to join him anyhow as καπνός from the kitchen, as a στροῦθος³ — a little πτωχαλάζων, a little συκοφάντης, but always insatiable, always on the look-out for an ἀνὴρ παχύς (288), for something to eat (238, 354, the treat of a process be it ever so small), whose γνώθοι nothing can withstand (155, 368), living an ἀγεννὴς βίος on the whole (506). But he is himself a poor master, who is robbed of all by his κόλακες and the κόλακες τῶν κολάκων, Cleon, the qualified flatterer, Cleonymus, θέ-ωλος (as ἐπιτορκος) etc.⁴; he himself, the δεσιπότης, ἄρχων, θεός, Ζεὺς, τιθασευτής, βασιλεύς (546), is in reality a δοῦλος of his own slaves (517, 653), that receive all sorts of good things from the subjects (676), while the Philocleon and his fellow-sufferers, although σμικρολόγοι, who always call for fining (τίνεσθαι) and money (χρήματα), in reality are themselves the φερέδευπνοι — to the τρεχέδευπνοι, as the parasites, in accordance with this Aristophanic word later on were called (401)⁵. All his misfortune however originates, according to Aristophanes, in his fatal taste for flattery (θωπεύματα 563, cp. 610)⁶, which he retains even as a dicastic wasp⁷. But in the world of the wasps the result is the same: the naughty flatterers, now drones, κηφῆνες, μένοντες ἔνδον τοῦρόφου (cp. οἰκουρὸς of Cleon as a dog), profit by his work (a simile already used by Hesiod Op. 302). Amongst the flatterers on the contrary all is joy and happiness, as Philocleon himself

¹ L. 600 σπόγγον ἔχον ἐκ τῆς λεκάνης τὰμβάδι ἡμῶν περικονεῖ, Ribbeck p. 11, cf. Peniculus in Plaut Men., Πινάκοσπόγγος Alciph. III 63 and the weapon of Sanga Ter. Eun. 777.

² whose behaviour is that of a κόλαξ: στοιχῶς ἐξαπατῶνται ὡς οἶεται, cp. Babr. 50, 14 σεσερός αἰκάλλειν (of a fox) and Pollux κίων προσσάινων, προσσεσηρός.

³ Cp. Struthias, Struthion and Ephippus fr. 6 τοῖσι στρονθίοις χανοῦσι ὁμοίως. Plaut. Trin. 1020 L.

⁴ Plaut. parasiti venatici, molossici (Capt. 85).

⁵ Already Epicharm says in his Elpis and his Periallos of the parasite: ἐκάλεσε γὰρ τὴν τὴν / ἐπ' αἰκλὸν ἀέκων· τὸ δὲ ἐκὼν ὦχεο τρέχων (fr. 37 and 110 K.).

⁶ τηροῦσι 551, ἐμβάλλει μοι τὴν χεῖρ' ἀπαλήν 554, ἰποκρίπτοντις 555, σκώπτουσι ἡ ἐγὼ γελᾶσω καὶ τὸν θυμὸν κατὰθωμαι.

⁷ The greatest flattery of a wasp is to address someone as a μελίττιον. »my little bee«, l. 367.

sees when taking part in their symposion with the rich *Φίλο-ζυγίων*: he characterizes them as *χομψοί*, their usual attribute, *χομψοδοιχῶντες*¹ *πρὸ τὸν τί πρῶτοντι δαί* (1318)², calls them poor devils, destitute of all, while he himself is called *νεόπλουτος* and *ὄνος* (*κλήτηρ* 1310, cf. 189). How the flatterers behave at the beginning of a festival, is told 1212 sqq.: we hear of their *ἀλωπεκίζειν* (cp. *ὑποπιθηκίζειν* 1290), of their *ἀστεῖα* and *γελοῖα*³, of their *εἰκάζειν* and *σκώπτειν* (cp. Blaydes' note to 1308), *τωτάζειν* and *κλέπτειν* (1368), of the lascivious songs and dances⁴ and of the excessive *ὕβρις* of these young people when drunk.

The description that Aristophanes gives us of these *θηρία*⁵, is to my opinion sufficiently exhaustive to enable us to form a clear idea of their way of living. As yet, however, Eupolis had not produced his *δεινα θηρία* on the stage, the parasites that utilised the rich Callias, the friend of the sophists. Whether the designation of the demagogues (as that of the sophists) as *κόλακες* was first invented by Socratic circles or not, it has at any rate been a favourite expression with them, as we may conclude from Plato *de re publ.*, where the *τέχνη κολακική* works on the *δόξαι ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐπιθυμίαι* (VII 533 B). In the crises which the different forms of government have to go through, the *κηφῆνες* play an important part. In the oligarchic state (VIII p. 552 B) some are very rich, others, *τῶν ἐτοίμων ἀναλωταί*, quite poor, and as in the hive the *κηφῆνες* are *σιμήνους νόσημα*, so in the state the *κεκεντρωμένοι* are all *κακοῦργοι*, the others remain *πτωχοί*. Exactly the same evolution as in the state may be observed in the individual (p. 559 E), where the young man tastes the honey of the drones and holds company with *αἰθῶσι θηρσὶ καὶ δεινοῖς*: then words and opinions *ψευδεῖς καὶ ἀλαζίνες* conquer the fortress and calling *τὴν μὲν αἰδῶ ἡλιθιότητα*, *σωφροσύνην δὲ ἀνανδρίαν*, *μετριότητα δὲ καὶ κοσμίαν δαπάνην ὡς ἀγροικίαν καὶ ἀνελευθερίαν* they drive these virtues out, importing in splendid procession the corresponding vices, which *ἱποκοριζόμενοι*⁶ they call *ὕβριν μὲν ἐν παιδευσίαν, ἀναρχίαν δὲ ἐλευθερίαν, ἀσωτίαν δὲ μεγαλοπρέ-*

¹ Cp. *τραπεζολογός, κνισολογός*.

² This sort of people pretend to be *δεξιοί* (1315), *σοφοὶ καὶ μοιτικοί* (1244), *καλοὶ τε καὶ αἰδοί* (1256).

³ Cp. Epicharm, fr. 35, 3: *τηντί δὲ χαρίεις τ' εἰμι καὶ ποιέω πολὺν | γέλωτα*. -- Only if the worst comes the parasite in Capt. 492, Stich 193 has recourse to *mores barbari*.

⁴ Cp. Pollux VI 122 and Ribbeck p. 96.

⁵ Aristophanes likes to call them monsters; besides the names above quoted from the Eq., cp. *ἀετός, θηρίον* (23 of Cleonymus), *φάλαίνα πανδοκεύτρια* (35 Cleon), *κόραξ*, Philocleon himself is a *κνώδαλον*, that addresses his son as *κάκιστον θηρίον* 448.

⁶ Cp. Ribbeck p. 97.

πειαν, ἀναίδειαν δὲ ἀνδρείαν¹. Plutarch adul. p. 56 is evidently influenced by Plato even when he does not mention his name, and he quotes from Thucyd. III 82, 4 the famous passage describing the »Umwertung aller Werte« (cp. his description of the leaders § 8). Still worse than in the oligarchic city is the rule which the drones wield in the democratic city (p. 564 D), here οἱ πλούσιοι are κηφήνων βοτάνη, who give the δῖμος but very little of the honey they have squeezed out (cp. Aristophanes supra) of the χρηματιζόμενοι. The extreme liberty necessarily generates the τύραννος, who calls in κηφήνας ξενικούς, μισθοφόρους (p. 567 D) and wastes τὰ πατρῷα in carouses as a prodigal son. Of course the flatterers attach themselves necessarily to such a tyrant (IX p. 575 E), and he is obliged to θωπεῖν his own slaves and grows into a κόλαξ τῶν θεραπόντων i. e. τῶν πονηροτάτων, (p. 575 A and D). According to Plato the flatterers are a permanent danger to individuals (cf. VII 538) as well as to society, even to the best of them. It seems evident that the philosopher has borrowed many colours from the rich pallet of Aristophanes to finish his portrait of the κόλαξ-κηφήν, as Aristophanes had styled him, when urging τὸ δριμύ of his nature towards society. In fact, the flatterer after this Platonic treatment might be said to be the fundamental evil of every social order, as we find him in our fragment of Menander's Κόλαξ.

But out of the purging fire of philosophic thought emerged the κόλαξ, stigmatized with a new epithet: ἄδικος². Injustice is the principal charge brought forward against him by the young man (l. 42):

οὐθεὶς ἐπλούτησεν ταχέως δίκαιος ὢν.

As ἄδικος he appears e. g. in Lucian de paras. c. 21: πῶς οὖν ὁ παράσιτος τὰ ἀλλότρια λαμβάνων οὐκ ἀδικεῖ μόνος, Alciphr. epp. I 5 ἐγὼ δὲ ἀγαπῶ τὴν τῶν ἀναγκαίων εὐπορίαν ἐκ τῆς καθημερινῆς ἐργασίας τῶν χειρῶν ποριζόμενος (contrasted with the sudden wealth which the addressee has acquired) ἀλλ' εἰ πλουτεῖς, σὺν τῷ δικαίῳ πλούτει. Already Aristophanes had suggested this conclusion as to the had morals of the Colax (cf. Eq. 1031 sqq.), Plut. 353 sqq.: τό τε γὰρ ἐξαίφνης ἄγαν / οὔτως ἱπερπλουτεῖν, τὸ δ' αἶ' δεδοικέναι / πρὸς ἀνδρὸς οὐδὲν ἔγιες ἐστ' εἰργασμένου, cf. 502 sqq.: πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὄντες πλουτοῦσι πονηροί / ἀδίκως αἰτὰ ξυλλεξάμενοι· πολλοὶ δ' ὄντες πάνι χρηστοί / πράττουσι κακῶς καὶ πεινῶσιν³.

¹ Cp. Ribbeck's description of the more elegant type of the flatterer p. 46.

² Cf. Ribbeck p. 11 sqq.

³ l. 43, cf. Plato de r. p. VIII 553 C γινόμενος — χρήματα συλλέγεται. Phoc. 5 μὴ πλουτεῖν ἀδίκως, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὁσίων βιοτεύειν.

L. 43 sq. seems to be a very solemn denunciation when applied to the behaviour of the flatterer. But Cleon in Aristophanes may be a good illustration of the ambush of a *κόλαξ*¹. Lucian compares his intrigues to stratagems used in the siege of a fortified town (cp. Plato supra), which is taken by night: *παντὶ τρόπῳ ὁ ὁθλος ἐνεδρευόμενος* (sc. *πρὸς τοῦ τοῦ κόλακος ἐπιβουλῶν*) § 23. To swear by the sun then is very appropriate (sol videt, Stich. 110).

L. 47. The speaker would have scolded the man in public, if it were not for the *σκευοφόρος*, who walks behind him carrying the *θάσια*, viz. *οὐνάρια* (Alex. fr. 275)².

L. 49. *πέρυσιν πτωχὸς ἦσθα καὶ νεκρὸς*, utterly destitute of means of living, cf. the bold metaphor Timocl. fr. 35 *μετὰ ζώντων τεθνηκώς*. In Plaut. Truc. 164 sqq. Diniarchus is no more incolumis, he has lived, mortuos est; Pseud. 309.

L. 50. *λέγε τίν' εἰργάζου τέχνην*. There is probably an allusion to the *κολακεία* as a «τέχνη», see Ribbeck l. c. p. 63 sqq., cf. Anaxandr. fr. 49, Alexis fr. 257, Antidotos fr. 2, Diodor fr. 2, Dionys fr. 2 l. 34, Diphil fr. 75, Plaut. Stich. 178³.

L. 51 sq.

οὐκ ἄπει

ἐκ τῆς[δε γῆς ἐτέρω]ωσε; τί διδάσκεις κακά;

The supplement fills exactly the lacuna. Cp. Aristoph. Eq. 698 *εἰ μὴ σ' ἐκφράγω / ἐκ τῆςδε τῆς γῆς* (cp. Vesp. 1230) and Acharn. 828 *εἰ μὴ τέρωσε συνοφαντήσεις τρέχων*. The omission of the article⁴ goes well

¹ Cp. Equit. 1032

*ἐξέδεταί σου τοῦτον ὅταν οὐ ποι ἄλλοσε χάσκης
ἐσφοιτῶν τ' ἐς τοῦτάνιον λήσσει σε κνηθδὸν
νύκτωρ τὰς λοπάδας καὶ τὰς νύσους διαλείχων.*

² not *κέραιοι* which the entertainers *μισθοῦνται εἰς ἐστίαν* (Alexis Phygas fr. 257). It is superfluous to call to mind Menand. fr. 319, Epinic. fr. 1, Hermipp. fr. 82, Aristoph. Plut. 1021, fr. 317, Antiph. fr. 140, Eubul. fr. 124, Antid. fr. 4, Plaut. Poen. 699, Fr. Com. R. p. 133 Ribb.

³ To practise, to work at a *τέχνη* is called *εργάζεσθαι*, cf. Alexis fr. 116 *ὁ μὲν τύπος / τῆς ἐργασίας εἰς ἐστὶ, κολακείας ἀγών*, and Antiphanes counts as the *μέγιστα ἔργα* of this «comfortable art» *παιδιά, ἀδρὸν γελάσαι, σκῶμμα, οἶνος* (fr. 144). Plato speaks of those *μεταχειριζόμενοι τὴν σοφιστικὴν τέχνην* (Protag. 316 D), cf. Athen. p. 255 b *οἱ τὴν κολακείαν μεταχειριζόμενοι*, de re p. II 374 C e. g. *εργάζεσθαι*. The parasite in Luc. de paras. 2 is a *δημιουργὸς τῆς τέχνης*.

⁴ Thucydides II 74, 3 in an oath: *ἐπὶ γῆν τήνδε ἤλθομεν*. Kühner-Gerth Gr. Satzlehre § 465 Anm. 6, a. It is quite irrelevant, whether the pronoun precedes or follows the

with the elevated tenour of the passage, cp. *λυσitteλεῖν* (and *ἀποφραίνοντες*). The flatterer is said to be a *διδάσκαλος τῆς ἀδικίας*, the young speaker is fresh from school with a sound philosophical training, reminding one of Plato's Gorgias, where the rhetor is a *κόλαξ φαῖλος*, who does not benefit the people; cp. Alexis fr. 203, where the flatterers are teachers *ἡ' ἀτέρου*, i. e. *τοῦ ἱγροῦ βίου*. On the other hand, when Aristophanes contrasts himself to the poets who flatter secretly, maintaining that he *τὰ βέλτιστα διδάσκει* (Acharn. 658 sqq.), he declares the subject of his teaching to be *τὸ εὖ καὶ τὸ δίκαιον*¹.

The art of flattering was always spoken of as a novelty, even when Hercules and Tantalus were the divine models, ever presenting new sides and recurring in novel forms, a pregnant expression of the tone of social intercourse at any time prevalent, of the up-to-date style of polite conversation (cp. Epicharm supra), of all moral evils lately sprung up, in contrast to the simple habits and sound morals of olden times. This seems to have been characteristic of the type when introduced on the Athenian stage; it was retained by Alex. Phrygas, where Chairephon *εἰρίσκει τέχνην*, by Menander, by Terence Eun. v. 247 *ego adeo hunc primus inveni viam* (as opposed to the old vulgar method of the flatterer, who makes himself a *γελωτοποιός* and receives *βέλη γελωτοποιά*, as Eupol. fr. 159).

L. 54. εἰς ἔστιν [ἄνηρ παμπονήρου τοῦ γένους
δι' οἷ τὰ πάντ' ἀπόλωλε, τρώφιμε, πράγματα.

The line is incomplete and appears to have been illegible in the original copy (perhaps the sign in front of the column has something to do with this). It seems necessary to refer δι' οἷ as well as *τοῦτο* l. 57 and 62 to a whole class, *γένος* or *φῦλον*, of malefactors or a widespread *κακόν*, to which this particular specimen is said to belong (cp. *τὸ τῶν παρασίτων γένος* Nicol. fr. 1 K., Timocl. fr. 8, 3, Plaut. Stich. 181 *genus nostrum*, Ter. Eun. 246). The flatterers subvert the whole society, cp. supra and Diphil. fr. 24 *ὁ γὰρ κόλαξ / καὶ στρατηγὸν καὶ δυνάστην καὶ φίλους*² *καὶ τὰς πόλεις / ἀνατρέπει λόγῳ κακοῖσιν μισθὸν ἡδύνας χρόνον*. A still closer resemblance to our passage Lucian de calumn. § 126 fin. exhibits: (αἱ οἷ ἀληθεῖς διαβολαὶ) ἔφ' ὧν ἤδη καὶ οἷοι

noun, Eu. El. 93 *οἱ κρατοῦσι τῆσδε γῆς*, 96 *πρὸς τέκνοντας γῆς τῆσδε*; Hel. 1058, Heraclid. 111 *τύραννος τῆσδε γῆς*, 1643 *γαῖας τῆσδε ἀναξ*; Hel. 805 *γεῖγε δ' ἐκ τῆσδε χθονός*, 1183 *γῆς τῆσδε ἐκκομισθεῖς*.

¹ As to the form of the sentence cp. Pseud. 204.

² Cp. Plaut. Stich. 628.

ἀνάσσειατοι γιγόντασι καὶ πόλεις ἄρδην ἀπολώλυσαν¹. — τρώμενος as ὁ νεώτερος οἰχοδομοῦντις, erilis filius minor, cp. Men. 194 with Kock's note².

L 58. ταύτας δ' ἤν [γαλιότατοι] ἐξείρηξ' ἐγώ,

A word like παντόλοον would suit the lacuna better³. Leo supplies δια τοῦτον (as we read l. 97). The slave who speaks surely wants to represent this particular flatterer as an example of a widespread evil, which now (adding to the weight of his assertion) he has found to destroy even the firmest. — ἐξείρηκε »found to be«, as e. g. Plat. Apol. 24 D τὸν διαφθείροντα ἐξευρών.

L. 60 sqq. As the most conspicuous situations in life Men. fr. 248 gives those of an ἄρχων, στρατηγός, ἡγεμὼν, δήμου πάλιν σύμβουλος; fr. 897 αἰλὰς θεραπείειν καὶ σατράπας of foreign affairs (cp. Kock F. C. G. III p. 437 fr. 145). Fr. 74 βίον / ὥς οἴκτρον ἐξαντιλοῦσιν οἱ τὰ φρούρια / τηροῦντες, οἱ τὰς ἀκροπόλεις κεκτημένοι⁴. Founders of new cities have been en vogue especially since Alexander's times. Cp. the poor fisherman suddenly, as he himself thinks, grown rich in Plaut. (Diphil.) Rud. 933 L.: ubi nobilitas mea erit clara / oppidum magnum communibo, ei ego urbi Gripo indam nomen / monumentum meae famae et factis, ibi qui regnum magnum instituam; Pseudol. 1100.

L. 61 sqq. οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ τοὺς τελέως λέγω

ἀπολωλότας μὲν, τοῦτ' ἀνίρηκεν μόνον

οἱ κόλακες· οὗ[τοι δ'] εἰσὶν αὐτοῖς ἄθλιοι,

as Blass reads the last line (»diese sind ihr Unglück«). The letters in the original can only be read OYT or OYH. Leo's restoration οὗτοι δ' εἰσὶν αὐτοῖς αἵτιοι seems rather a superfluous addition (it is hard to supply τῆς ἀναιρέσεως from ἀνίρηκεν). Nor is the reading of Blass quite satisfactory, as the sentence closes in rather an abrupt way. Perhaps

¹ In later times Heraclides of Tarent, ὁ κολακικώτατος, was said to have been τοῦ καταστραφῆναι τὴν τοιαύτην βασιλείαν αἰτιώτατος, sc. that of Philip (Polyb. XIII 4)

² Leo supplies λέγω σοι πάλιν, an emphasis suitable in a tutor but rather strong here (one might think of τοίνυν or ὦ τάλαν too).

³ παντόλοον, παντοῦροον, ἐπίβολλον seem to be too weak. Cp. Nicol. fr. 1 πρὸς χάριν ὁμῖλει τοῦ τρέποντος ἐπ' ὀλέθρου. (I have also thought of καὶ τοῦτοι).

⁴ Plut. Moral. 547 cd καὶ κόλακι καὶ παρασίτῳ δίσοιστον ἐν γρείῳ καὶ δυσκαρτέροισιν ἐαντὸν ἐγκωμιάζων πλούσιός τις ἢ σατράπης ἢ βασιλεύς. That the situation of a phrurarch was considered as an eminent position of trust is shown by Lucian dial. meretr. 9, 5 ἐγκωμιάτιον ἐγροῖρεις τάχα διμοιρίτης ὄν, ἵνα καὶ τοῦτο προσχαρίσωμαί σοι.

τοῖς ἄθλιοι is a slight misreading on the part of the copyist for τρισάθλιοι, and the whole sentence originally ran thus: οὕτως δ' εἰσιν αἱ τρισάθλιοι, »in this way they (οἱ τελέως ἀπολωλότες) again (i. e. considering their former wealth) have become quite wretched«.

L. 64. A. σοβαρὸς μὲν ὁ λόγος· ὅτι δὲ τοῦτ' ἔστιν κατὰ οὐκ οἶδ' ἔγωγε. B. πᾶς τις ἂν κρίνας κακῶς εἴνουν ἐπολάβοι τὸν ἐπιβουλεύοντά σοι.

To σοβαρὸς cp. fr. inc. 1150 K. (Phot. ἐπαιρόμενος, τολμηρός, αὐθάδης). The slave in his rash and passionate way has not only found this modern evil to be universal, but he thinks that he is able to show its true source, the bad κρίσις of the flattered person¹. Already Cleon had Aristoph. Eq. 748 summoned his master, the Demos, to διακρίνειν ὁπότερός ἐστι εὐνοότερος; cp. Menander fr. 691 (Monost. 276). Lucian pro imag. 21 recommends such a διάκρισις κολακείας καὶ ἐπαίνου ἀληθοῦς, and Epigr. 10 he considers the flatterers τὸ χαλεπώτατον, καθαράν ψευδόμενοι φιλίαν; Plut. de adul. 50 C χαλεπὸν ἐστι διακρίναι τὸν κόλακα (φιλίας ὑποκριτήν) καὶ τὸν φίλον². Such a discrimination was difficult especially in Athens, the home of οἱ κόλακες τῶν κολάκων, as we are told in Plaut. Merc. 839 ubi qui amici qui infideles sint nequeas pernoscere.

The question now arises: how did the conversation turn on the flatterer? To be able to give an answer, one must look more closely at

Col. I,

this desperate, if not *dimidiatus*, at least semesus *Menander*³. According to the reconstruction that Blass gives of the first lines the father of the

¹ In a similar way Diphilus speaks of the κόλαξ fr. 24: τὴν δὲ καὶ κακίᾳ τις ἐποδέδυνκε τοὺς ὄχλους / αἱ κρίσεις θ' ἡμῶν τοσοῦτοι, καὶ τὸ πρὸς χάριν πολὺ (γίλους not to be altered).

² Lucilius 717 M can tell the difference between the two: amici quærent animum, rem parasiti et ditias. As to false friends cp. Bacch. 540—51 (from Menander, Leo Forsch. 118). Mil. gl. 1365 [Palæstrio, in many respects a perfect parasite] tum demum scibis tibi qui bonus sit qui malus.

³ When through the great courtesy of the editors I inspected the fragment, I did not feel sure of the reading of the first letter l. 7 (the N seemed to me an AI) and of the word ΠΟ[Ι]ΛΕΙΣ l. 24 (behind Π there seemed to be room enough for one letter + the right half of a Λ. But I trust the admirable skill of the editors more than my eyes, although I think the matter worthy of notice).

young man is abroad on business, and the son with the old slave is left at home utterly destitute of money:

l. 4 *ἔστι γὰρ ἐξέλκυσεν] ἐπὶ πρῶτος τινας*
ὁ πατήρ κατέκλεν οἷόν] ἐμοὶ ξανόν
καὶ *ἐν παιδάριον αἰὶς ἰσοφύην*
ἐπορυσάμην. τὴν μὲν] διοικηταὶς ἔσαν
ἐπέτρεψε.

This seems to be a very probable supplement of the lost half of the first lines, except, as Leo remarks, that the son must earn his living himself. Leo thinks that the first line . . . *ων τῶν πατέ[ρων μεμ]νημένος* refers to the father of the speaker who, remembering his clever forefathers now after a long and thriftless life has gone abroad to repair his desperate affairs. But it seems to be very improbable that the father has ruined the family. In Plaut. Trin., which play because of the *διοικηταί* (112, 877) may conveniently be compared to our passage, just the reverse is the case (cp. Phormio 299 sqq., where the father has left his son without any money). Now Leo thinks that the exposition of the drama is this: The young man, who loves a girl that belongs to a leno, is just returning from the market; he complains to one of the female servants of the leno (or the meretrix, Doris l. 18), deploring that he has no money to buy the girl. Then appears the old faithful slave of the family, with whom the youth discusses the enviable position and ostentatious display of his rival, his new neighbour, the soldier, and the character of his abominable companion, the flatterer. After this, they go into the house, and the leno appears on the stage, discussing with others, whose aim is to utilise the soldier, what to do with the girl just spoken of. In this way we get acquainted with the principal characters of the comedy, we are informed of the difficulties that the young lover has to overcome in order to get the better of his rival and guess the development of the plot. On the whole, this ingenious reconstruction may be both dramatic and Menandrian, but still there remain several difficult points which require closer attention.

As Leo has observed, the banquet in question (l. 11) is that of the tetradists. But it seems to be quite impossible that the soldier should celebrate this in company with the young people (cp. Blass). If with Leo we read l. 11 as follows:

τιδὲ, τετραὺς γὰρ, σίνωδος ἡμῶν γίνεται

and give the line to the young lover, he cannot well in the next line speak of the soldier as a *δεσπότης*. This word may designate a man as the master of a slave or a meretrix or a parasite and might be given

to such a person speaking, or spoken to, or spoken of, but Doris at any rate cannot be supposed to belong to the soldier. Somebody's master is going to give a banquet and this somebody may be the soldier or the brothel-keeper (Rud. 61) or even the young man himself. What we know of the banquet is told in Athen. XIV 659 *Μένανδρος ἐν Κόλακι τὸν τοῖς τετραδισταῖς διακονοῦμενον μάγειρον ἐν τῇ τῆς πανδήμου Ἀφροδίτης ἐορτῇ ποιᾷ ταῦτα λέγοντα*; then follows the speech of the cook, spending to all Olympian gods. Moreover Nævius had in his adaptation of the Menandrian Colax — of which Terence, according to what he himself confesses, did not know (Eun. Prol. 25 sqq.) — introduced the *soldier*, a sort of Pseudohercules (Men.), passing himself off as Hercules Victor, to whom a tenth is due¹, and a *parasite* announcing as his tribute, in the name of »Hercules« a festival to *his* Hercules², the invincible paragon of all parasites. Now we know the 4th day of the month to be sacred to Hercules as well as to Aphrodite and to Hermes. If we here are allowed to combine Nævius with our fragment, we get two festivals, one celebrated in honour of Hercules by the soldier and his train, another in honour of Aphrodite by the *νέοι*. For this latter party the cook in Athenæus displays his skill, on which occasion he, imitating his divine prototype Hermes, sacrifices to all Olympian gods.

Now the brothel-keeper as the giver of the banquet is out of the question, and we may hesitate between the old slave of the family and the parasite as speaker of the lines. The English editors believe they have found some faint resemblance between the first lines of our fragment and the introductory speech of Gnatho in the Eunuch. The »single boy« mentioned l. 6 together with *οἷτος τροφήν* sc. *παρέχει* of the military *τρόφιμος*, »the house void of everything«, and a *vestis unica* (Stich. 257, 360, Curc. 355) which might have been mentioned l. 6 might appropriately be applied to a person »qui patria abligurrierat bona« (Ter. Eun. 235)⁴. But Struthias is sure to have set forth his new method of fowling in a soliloquy, as the parasite elsewhere does, and as Gnatho does, when

¹ Cp. Plaut. Truc. 562.

² Ribbeck FCR p. 12, cp. Curc. 358, Bacch. 665, Stich. 233 ut decumam partem Herculi polluceam (386, 395). It is quite natural that the parasite especially swears by Hercules, as Stich. 475, 480, 495, 497, 588, 610. About the Epicharmean Hercules *ἀδηνάγος* cp. v. Salis l. c. p. 30. A banquet for ten Stich. 487.

³ Even the Phormio of Ter.-Apollod. has retained some traces of this ordinary way of introducing the parasite 330 sqq. (a rather awkward exposition, when addressed to the slave of his patron).

⁴ Cp. Lucil 171 Marx.

he makes his first appearance in the Eun. If the editors are right in their supposition (which they besides resign themselves), we should take the whole as a part of the introductory speech of the parasite, telling us of his interview with a person in an equally desperate position, item qui abligurrierat bona. Then in l. 2 there might be a relation between τῶν πατέρων μεμνημένος (according to Leo's restitution) and θαυμάζ' ἰδὼν νῦν σ' ἵον ὡς πᾶσιν δοκεῖ, κακῶς ἔχοντα and l. 8 sq. ἐμοὶ πιθό- μινος ὁ κακοδαῖμον τεχὼν ἴσως / λίγους ἂν διάγων ἀθλίως σίτω σφόδρα: / σὲ δὲ γὰρ λέγει μοι τοῦτ' ὅ μοι ποιτέον: then 11 as Leo τῇδ', τὰ τὰς γὰρ, σύνοδος ἡμῖν γίνεται, and then ἅπασι δ' ἐστὶν ἐστιάτωρ δισπότης / καὶ πάντας ἀθρόους δέχεσθαι εἶπε μοι, cp. the cena popularis Trin. 470 (Eu. Ion 1140) and Ter. Eun. 1082. As an assecla or discipulus¹ the miserable good-for-nothing has to follow his new master to the public præsæpis. Only in the following lines we do not become aware of the parasite until, as we may suppose, l. 34 sqq., where the words σκώπ- τομεν and ἔχομεν might belong to such a person (l. 36 ἀπαιῶμεν αἰτόν, σκώπτομεν). As for παῖδες l. 37, it might be addressed to the pupils of the disciplina Gnathonica or Struthonica. At any rate, I cannot see how to explain παῖδες, if with Leo we suppose only the young Athenian, Doris, and the old slave to be on the stage. On the other hand, if the parasite speaks these lines and leaves the stage after l. 38, the following verses may naturally be given to a young man, just becoming aware of him, i. e. the master of the old slave who speaks l. 54 sqq. He is infuriated at the sight of the wealthy good-for-nothing fellow just walking off (N.B. ἐβράδιζε l. 46 — he seems to be arriving just in this moment) in his parasitic manner, κατέπτηκεν l. 39. This means »crouch from fear«, e. g. Aristoph. Eqq. 1490, where Blaydes quotes Plut. Alc. p. 193 c ἔπτηξ' ἀλέκτωρ δοῦλον ὡς κλῖνας πετρόν, and Lucian Timon 5 ἐπειδὴ πένης ἐγενόμην, οὐκέτι προσβλέτουνσιν οἱ τέως ἵποπτήσ- σοντες καὶ προσκυνοῦντες². Then we might supply l. 39 sqq. τὴ κ κατέπτηκεν; πόθεν / πλουτῶν; λέγοιμ' ἂν ἢ σατράπην³ ἢ στρατολόγον / ὡς πλοῦταξ ἀδικῶν ἐστι δῆλός ἐστι: πῶς: / οὐθεὶς ἐπλού- τησεν ταχέως δίκαιος ὢν etc. But if this supplement is adopted, the chief difficulty lies in the presence of Phidias and Doris, who must be on the stage according to l. 18 sq. The lines may have run thus: νῦν ἐγὼ,

¹ Cp. Pseud. 865, 886.

² Cp. Fugit. 12 ἐπιτιμώτων ἵποπτήσοονσι. Ribbeck p. 42 cites Apulejus Physiogn.: summittunt sese et omne corpus infringunt (ut canes), cp. ὑποπίπτειν. From poultry another expression παραπτερυγίζειν is taken; Posidipp. fr. 26 K. l. 13 ἔπτηξ' ἔλαστος. — πτήσσειν ταπεινὴν Eu. Andr. 166 of a female slave.

³ Cp. Ter. (Men.) H. timor. 452 satrapa si siet etc.

Δωρί, σε λέγω- / : τί δῆτα (χρήμα) ποιεῖν, Φειδία: θαρρεῖν, ἔμοι / τῆς [Χορναίδος]
 γὰρ τῆς ἐμῆς ταύτης μέλει: / — καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς: ἐάν τις εἴπῃ, γλῆναρον /
 τί δ' ὠφελεῖ; »δῆσποιν' Ἀθίνα, σῶζέ με«; / σῶζει γὰρ οἱ· φυλάττ' ἀκρι-
 βῶς τὰ πάτρια / καὶ εὐσεβεῖ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτοῦς· τίλεις, ἄνδρες
 τὰ πόλλ' ἀτυχοῦσι: τί λέγεις, ἄθλιε. Then exasperated at this question
 he intensifies his assertions: the gods not only do not help the pious,
 but even favour the bad. The tenour of the passage is seen from the
 following restoration by Leo:

συλλαμβάνειν γε τοῖς] πονηροῖς τοὺς θεούς·
 ἀγαθοὶ γὰρ ὄντες οὐδέ]ν ἀγαθὸν πράττομεν.
 ἀλλ' ὅδε διμοιρίτης] φέρων αὐτὸς ποτε
 θώρακα, σάγμα, σαύνη]ον, πήραν, κράνος
 σκόλοπας, σκαπάνην, γύλι]ον, διβολίαν, κώδιον

Then Blass: νυνὶ δὲ ταῦτα πάντ' αἰ]νχῆς ὄνος φέρει.

Perhaps

νῦν πορφυράν ὁ τοῖς αἰ]νχῆς ὄνος φέρει,
 ὁ δὲ στρατιώτης ἐγένετ' ἐξ]αίρνης Βίας.

As to the whole sentence cp. Menand. Theophr. fr. 223 K: (man)
 ἀδίκως εἴτυχεῖ / κακῶς τε πράττει τοῦτο τὸ ζῶον μόνον πράττει
 δ' ὁ κόλαξ ἄριστα πάντων etc. As for the blasphemy see e. g. Plaut.
 Bacch. 638 deus respiciet nos aliquis — nugæ, vale, 119; Pseud. 269
 (cp. 356), Pers. 251 and 753 (a very solemn prayer of thanksgiving), Haut.
 tim. 1038. A soldier διμοιρίτης is scolded by a rich tradesman Luc.
 Dial. meretr. 9: ἐρυμάτιον ἐφροῦρεις τάχα διμοιρίτης ὢν, ἵνα καὶ τοῦτο
 προσχαρίσωμαί σοι. Concerning the costume of a swell soldier see
 Leo's note to Plaut. Curc. 356, and for the change of name according
 to the new way of living or social position cp. Plaut. Capt. 285(8),
 Poen. 1139, Ps. 193, Stich. 242, Bacch. 362. The verse is formed in the
 same way as Ar. Vesp. 49 ἄνθρωπος ὢν εἴτ' ἐγένετ' ἐξ]αίρνης κόραξ¹.

If we restore ll. 25—32 as above, a new difficulty arises concern-
 ing l. 14—18. In l. 15 the editors supply πλούτω before λαμπρόν,
 cp. Men. fr. 538 μέγα φρονοῦντων ἐπὶ γένει καὶ χρήμασιν αἰτῶν τε δόξῃ,
 fr. 466, 281, Antiphan. 123 ἢ γεγονέναι λαμπρὸς ἢ τεθνηκέναι; Ar. Eqq.
 430 ἔξειμι γὰρ σοι λαμπρὸς ἤδη καὶ μέγας καθιείς. Consequently
 the sense may be rendered thus: δεῖ το . . . εντ . . . / πλούτω γενέσθαι
 λαμπρὸν ἢ δόξῃ, μέγαν / τεύξει γὰρ οὕτως πάντος· εἰ δὲ μή, τρίτον / λείπει
 τεθνάναι². If Doris is the servant of the leno, and if she takes part in
 the dialogue just spoken of, these words can hardly belong to any

¹ L. 31 concludes as FCA Kock III p. 424 ὁ γὰρ φέρει νῦν οὗτος, τίς οὗτος φέρει.

² There must be some error in the text l. 17; ἀγρίαν ἄγε χόλον? or βιοτήν?

other than herself: she has given up every hope of the success of the unfortunate Phidias, who relies upon himself, on nothing else in the world.

Now one may think it possible that the person who leaves the stage l. 38 is Doris and that the lines that precede the discussion between Phidias and Doris belong to the opening of their dialogue. Then we might supply l. 2' sqq.: (Doris) τῶν σῶν πατέρων μεινήμενος / οἰκτεῖρ' ὀρθῶσα σ' ἔον ὥς πᾶσιν δοξεί ζῶντι ἀθλίως. (Phid.) ἀπῆλθεν ἐπὶ πράξεις τις ὁ παῖς, ἔλκοιεν δ' οἰκίαν ἑμοῖ ζηνὶ πῶτων; αἰτός might be an ἀγρός to live on (cp. Pl. Trin.), and the δεσπότης the brothel-keeper, giving a banquet to the soldier. L. 34 sqq. she might have mentioned their behaviour to the stupid and conceited soldier. However, I should think it impossible to restore the lines throughout so as to make them fit this hypothesis. Another way would be to take Δωρίς in the incomplete l. 18 for corrupt or as an apostrophe of the lover to the absent girl, so that we have only Phidias and his old slave on the stage, but to this supposition οἴχομαι l. 38 offers an insurmountable difficulty. I should think it most probable that the parasite is on the stage during the dialogue of Phidias and Doris and that he leaves the stage l. 38, when he is observed by Phidias (or a friend of his), l. 39. He may in the mean time have been to the house of the leno in order to fetch the girl in question to the soldier's banquet; the difficulty which this offers to the leno is the subject of the discussion in col. III.

Col. III.

As Blass has seen, the dialogue is between somebody pleading in the favour of the young lover (a friend of Phidias, cp. col. I, or his slave?) and the brothel-keeper. He reads with the editors l. 82 sq.:

μεταπέμψεθ' ἑτέρους [δὲ] στρατ[ιώτας, ῥαδίως
οἷ[ς π]αραφυλάξει· παῖδες· ἐκτρέβο[μεν ἄν.

Leo συστρατιώτας; παῖδες¹ is difficult, we expect παῖδας (sc. μεταπέμψεται, as Blass takes it).

l. 84 ἦτοι ποθ' οἷτος ἢ σὲ πιστευθεὶς λ[έγων
ὑπεραντίον τε μηθὲν ὧν ποεῖς [νοεῖν

¹ The editors read l. 83 ΠΑΙΔΕΣ; H may be a T, but for πόντες (as Leo thinks possible) there is not room enough.

δόξας ἔχεις τὸν ἄνδρ' ἀφύλακτον ἐ[κποδών
τῶν πραττομένων τῆς οἰκίας· ὅταν δὲ δῇ.

The reading of l. 89 is very uncertain; the fourth letter (Δ of the editors) may be a Δ or an A and as to the following Θ I could only see something like the left leg of a Δ , and the H I should think looks more like an O . The leno maintains that on the side of the young man there is only evident poverty (or that he himself wants ready money, φανερός), then l. 89

οὐ λειμοὶ [λόγους
ἔχοντες ἐν ταῖς χειρσίν, ἄλλο δ' οὐδὲ ἐν[.

Xenarch. fr. 4 l. 20 K. δεδιότα ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἔχοντα; but here we expect something like Ter. Phorm. 145: non multum habet quod det fortasse? *Ge.* nihil nisi spem meram (cp. v. 500). L. 95 ὅς ἐμὴν πέπρακας? L. 96 τῷδ' . . . τιὰδα πολλῷ; L. 97 between M and N there is room enough for two letters. Leo reads: οὐ θέλομε]ν, οὐ δια τοῦτον ἢ μία λαμβάνει / ὅσον οὐχ]ι δέκα τρεῖς μῆας ἐκάστης ἡμέρας ἀπὸ τοῦ] ξένου. L. 100 sq. αἰτὴν ἐμοῦ γὰρ ἀρπάσονθ' ὅταν τέχη / κἀγὼ δικάσομαι?

Another papyrus fragment has been referred by Blass to the Colax of Menander, Flinders-Petrie Papyri, Vol. I p. 16 ed. Mahaffy, s. Hermes 33, 654 sq. and Rhein. Mus. 55, 102.

I give a transcription of the original as I read it in the Brit. Mus.

Col. I.	Col. II.
ἐνταυριμ [	
θωνοιοσεστινυμφωι	
τιμειομενηδητουτοχε	
αλλαπονταχιστιδε · ν	
5 ντιωσεκεινωιδημεα	
ειασοτιδιατριωμολισ	· ·
τικαιχασμωμετωι	χα
τονστρατηγοννηδια	δευροβια[
ιδ · μεναλληρεστιγαρ	ωδυσ[
10 ικορεισυπερβολην	ωλ · · ·
ιναιοσουτοσραιδιωσ	δαιισχαλ[
ταυτατοιγαρουνησμεν	· · ωχη · ·
ευροκαιμενεωσεχεισ	· · · · ·
	· υροσ ·
υωμενημε · ουκεχει	

Col. I. l. 1 ϵ or η or θ and for μ may be read a ν . L. 3 η may be $\gamma\eta$ as well, but not η , cp. l. 5 $\delta\eta\mu$ and l. 15 $\gamma\mu$; the γ has got the loop of a ρ . L. 6 $\mu\alpha\sigma$ or $\mu\alpha\sigma$ but hardly $\mu\alpha\sigma$. L. 13 $\theta\sigma$ or $\eta\sigma$. L. 14 $\epsilon\chi\mu$ or $\epsilon\chi\sigma$. Col. II l. 4 ω $\delta\epsilon\sigma\tau$: the τ may just as well be the beginning of a π .

The conjectures of Blass are naturally rather hypothetical and the likeness between our lines and Ter. Eun. IV 6 and 7 does not go very far. But the observation of Blass that there is a description of an attack of a soldier Bias and his followers upon another party of young men (Demeas l. 5) gathered around the more successful rival (*νυμφίω* l. 2?) seems to make it possible to restore some of the mutilated lines. In l. 5 at any rate Blass has, as to the sense, filled the gap in a very satisfactory way: *ἀλλὰ πού τ' ἀχιστ' ἰδεῖν στήναι τ' ἐνα]ντίως ἐκείνῳ, Δημεία.* L. 6 one of the fighters (Demeas?) thinks his party rather small in number: *διὰ τριῶν μόλις / ἀντέχομεν: ἐπιλαγέντι καὶ χασμωμένῳ;* which latter question may belong to the girl, the leno or someone else who encourages her defenders. Then perhaps the parasite: *χρὴ γ' εὐλαβεῖσθαι τὸν στρατηγὸν¹ νῆ Δία* and l. 9 *ἔστι γὰρ / . . . ἑβριστικὸν εἰς ἐπεροβολήν.* The first column, as Blas remarks, seems to contain the preliminaries of the battle, the disposition of the troops (Bl. in l. 13 *πρόσελθε δεῦρο καὶ μὲν, ὥς ἔχεις / ὅσ' ἂν παρεγγ]υῶμεν*), the second the attack itself. The fragment well deserves the attention of scholars.

¹ Ter. Eun. 799 and 778 *imperatoris virtutem noveram et vim militum*, cp. 495.

The Contamination in the Eunuch of Terence.

When dealing with the Greek fragment of Menander's *Colax* one will always try to get a clearer idea of the way in which Terence has utilized the Greek original for his popular play the *Eunuch*. Leo l. c. p. 690 concludes that Terence has only transferred the *characters*, Bias and Struthias, into Menander's *Eunuch*, without in any way altering the action. The rival in the *Eunuch* has been replaced by the excellently drawn soldier of the *Colax*; whether in the *Eunuch* there was a soldier followed by a parasite or not, we cannot tell, but certainly there was a rival. From the *Colax*, according to Leo, are derived: II 2 monologue of Gnatho, III 1, 391—5, 434 sqq.; in III 2, IV 7, V 7, 8 Terence has only altered the *Eunuch* so far as to give room for the two characters from the *Colax*. In fact, there is not much likeness between the action of the *Eunuch* and that of the *Colax*, and on this point we now can speak with much more certainty than Grauert and Ihne did. Terence is in the main speaking the truth when mentioning in the prologue typical *characters* only, which he has transferred from one drama of Menander to the other. Still it is well worth while to inquire more closely into the way in which he has made his »contaminatio« and on the whole into his method of working for the Latin stage.

It is very interesting to see how Terence has introduced the two persons in question on the stage. First Gnatho appears, describing himself in the usual manner, in a monologue, his living and showing his character, and the truth of his assertions he then proves through his subsequent behaviour. He has been sent by his master to present Thais with his new gift, the girl, and to invite her to the banquet; this done he leaves the stage. But after the scene where the plan is agreed upon between Parmeno and Chærea, Thraso once more appears in company with the soldier — the latter is eager to see with his own eyes the effect of his present and to fetch Thais off to the feast. The parasite follows rather unwillingly, as he longs for the dinner even more than his master for the full possession of his love (459, 491). As a matter of fact the soldier's presence is now quite superfluous to the development of the plot, but the poet wants to show him off to the public, and thus we learn to know the soldier as an exultant victor (in his own opinion), as a combatant and as a defeated enemy who makes peace on the best terms possible.

In the *Colax* there cannot have been any mention of gifts of that kind; here the beloved girl belongs to a brothel-keeper, and *Bias* has arrived at the house of the leno either for the feast or to make some arrangements with the owner concerning the girl. Now the excellent way in which the presence of *Thraso* is psychologically explained, his childish impatience to tell about his success with *Thais* (he wants the pleasant words to be repeated: *ain tu, lætast*), the few master-strokes that at once make his well-known features as well as those of his parasite stand out clearly¹ (*αἰ θαδύς* and *ἀλαζόν*, v. 396 cp. 1092, *Mil. gl.* 91, 778, 1200), the way again in which he leaves the stage, his nervous impatience and fickleness (465, 491 *jamne imus*, 494 *ego hinc abeo*, 499 *abi præ*) — this entrance and this exit must be given either to Terence himself or to some other play utilized by Terence in this scene or to the *Eunuch* itself. Then the rival of the young lover has in the *Eunuch* been a soldier. The opening words (*magnas vero agere gratias . . .*) may very well belong to Menander himself (cp. Donatus to v. 391 and v. 46), and on the whole the lines are almost too much to the point to be a mere technical expedient of a skillful contaminator. The lines then may belong to a soldier and a parasite of another, perhaps Menandrean play, in a situation identical to that of ours. Moreover, there is a break in the continuity of the conversation l. 434 (*sed heus tu . . .*) where the soldier rather abruptly, although not inconsistently with his disjointed character, falls to talking of his relation to *Thais* and the best way of ensuring himself her permanent love. Here not a word can be derived from the *Colax*, where there is no occasion to speak of the free love of a free girl (v. 446 does not go too well with the unparalleled self-confidence of which he was possessed until now: *siquidem me amaret, tum istuc prodesset, Gnatho*)². The part that the parasite plays here as the expert counsellor of the soldier in affairs of love, is just the same that he later plays in front of the house of *Thais* 811 sqq.: *novi ingenium mulierum* etc. In the same way the beginning of III 2 is not taken from the *Colax* but from *The Eunuch*. Here we can form a conception of the difficulties that such a contamination caused the translator. *Thais* has *just* heard the soldier talking, as she tells us when stepping out from her house, v. 455 — rather out of place if we imagine the whole first scene preceding, but a just remark if we make the scene begin with v. 434. Moreover *Parmeno* makes at

¹ triumphat, see Donatus v. 394 and v. 417.

² Cp. Ihne *Quæstt. Terent.* p. 19. — As for the soldier's diffidence in this respect I refer to *Mil. gl.* 1115 sqq., 983, 1024, 1036.

least one remark upon the two abominable antagonists of his master, which seem to indicate that he has just become aware of the handsome couple: 457 sqq. *quam venuste quod dedit principium adveniens . . . [Gnatho] eamus ergo ad cenam. quid stas? [Parm.] em alterum* (cp. 297), *ex homine hunc natum dicas*¹? This is rather strange, if Parmeno has the whole time been listening to the dialogue of the two during the preceding scene, quite natural though if he has just entered the stage. Then Terence himself has at this moment introduced the slave as elsewhere² in order to get more persons on the stage and to show the immediate effect of the worthy couple on the mind of a person belonging to the opposite side, thus anticipating the sentiments of the public itself. It is probable that v. 394 has had its original place somewhere after v. 434 (or 454?) and the two remarks à part 419 and 431 the contaminator has himself inserted into the original text. But the Terentian Parmeno retains the character of the old slave in Menander's Colax, especially his strong aversion from the parasitic species.

But even in scene 2 we may detect vestiges of the Colax. Leo has referred to 498 (*illud de Rhodio dictum*), and it seems to me that 486—491 must have been more appropriate in the Colax than in the Eunuch: *adparet servum hunc esse domini pauperis / miserieque etc.* Phædria in the Eunuch cannot in any way be said to be *poor*, but that the lover in the Colax was oppressed by extreme poverty, we now know from the new fragments³.

On the other hand, the description that Terence gives of the soldier is in harmony with the features that elsewhere are attributed to this type by *Menander* or those who composed in his style. The soldier's extraordinary salacity v. 479 at any rate has its parallel in Mil. gl. 1111⁴. In the same way, in a passage that surely did not belong to the Colax, v. 451 sqq., the parasite pretends to be highly admiring his master's ingenuity and prudence: *idem hoc tute melius quanto invenisses, Thraso* — according to the rule laid down by himself in the

¹ A reference to the parasite as *γῆγενης*? cp. 489.

² Cp. e. g. Plaut, Stich. 196 sqq., where he has amplified that original whence he borrowed his Gelasimus (Leo Forsch. 152, Über den Stich. des Plaut. p. 383).

³ v. 491 *cibum e flamma petere*, cp. Eupol. fr. 162 K., Cratin jun. fr. 8 K., Lucil fr. 659 Marx.

⁴ The soldier's stammering speech 404 sq. cp. Mil. gl. 36 (he tries to find some choice expressions, such as he might have heard from the parasite himself, who completes the sentence in a manner truly fitting the military man (*mores stratiotici* Mil. 1359; cp. Menand. fr. 563 K.). V. 413 cp. Mil. gl. 25.

Colax (v. 289): *cis ultro adrideo et eorum ingenia admiror simul*¹. And the same trait of character we observe v. 791: *quantist sapere, numquam accedo ad te quin abeam doctior*, which again has its parallel in Mil. gl. 1320 (cp. Poenulus 1200). The soldier and his parasite may be said to be Menandrian whether they are derived from the Colax or from some other drama, if not from the Eunuch itself. I think it very probable that the rival of Phædria in the Eunuch has been a soldier, and if we think of the striking parallel between the timid Chremes who prefers a peaceful solution of all difficulties 760 and the military coward who v. 789 follows the same line of politics, we are more inclined to give this to Menander than to Terence, i. e. we take it to belong to the Eunuch.

I think we shall arrive at a similar solution of the problem when we consider the last appearance of the soldier and the parasite. That such an agreement between the two rival parties should have taken place in the Colax, is out of the question, considering the opinion that the poor lover and his slave entertain of the genus *parasiticum*. The Colax can only have ended in the utter defeat of the soldier as well as his parasite. But the Eunuch, where Thais was a free meretrix kept by a lover and still had to be subsidized, may, we easily imagine, have had a similar conclusion, although the poverty of Phædria which is emphasized in 1075 (cp. 353 sq.) may still show the influence of the Colax. The wish of Gnatho to be quit of the soldier and to join the *grex*² of the rivalling party, is rather inappropriate³. And compared with Chremes at any rate the soldier is *minus potens*⁴, *minus notus*, *minus amicorum hic habens* (760). The Eunuch very probably presented a soldier and a parasite, which characters Terence has made more interesting to his Roman public by contaminating them with the classical pair of Menander in his Colax (Ihne p. 18)⁵. In consequence of the contamination there is a tendency to emphasize the richness of the soldier and the poverty of his rival, the indignation of the slave and the exquisite irony of the parasite⁶. In the Colax the main interest seems to have attached itself

¹ Cp. Epicarm Elp. f. 35, 4 Kaibel.

² Cp. decuria Plaut, Persa 143.

³ For v. 1090 cp. Mil. gl. 1027 and 1042.

⁴ i. e. dives, 353 (cp. Ad. 502) = fortis, Plaut.

⁵ Ihne maintains that the unhappy lover always is a soldier; Ælian. epp. 9 however (as for his dependence on the comedy see Willamowitz Hermes 40, 170) presents Thrasykleous as a successful lover and cp. moreover Cleomachus in the Bacchid, and Diabolus in the Asin.

⁶ V. 270—88 are likely to have been transferred from the Eunuch itself. The verses are full of *parasitica elegantia*, ironia and *ταπεινῶς τῷ ἀστεισμῷ* (Donatus).

to the parasite, in the Eunuch we are chiefly interested in the various adventures of the meretrix and her people. In the Colax the slave, the hater of parasites, should not easily have recommended the meretrices as Parmeno does 932.

Successful as Terence undoubtedly was in his contamination of the Colax with the Eunuch (more so than when contaminating the Andria with the Perinthia or Menander's second Adelphi with the Synapothn. of Diphilus), still he cannot have been quite equal to this difficult task of adapting different originals for the Latin stage, nor has he fully mastered his own inventions when he did venture some innovations of his own.

Chærea serves as a recruit at Piræus, that he may be unknown to Thais and her servants, who in the meantime have settled in the neighbourhood of his father's house, and to the soldier (who by the way has not been in Athens for a very long time, 760). It is true that Chærea seems to be astonished to come across his father's old friend, whom he has not seen for some six or seven months (331) and he wonders that Thais is living next door to his father and regrets not having seen her before. But he is fully acquainted with the bargain that his brother had made the previous day when buying the old eunuch¹. Terence at one time seems to suggest that the sight of Pamphila has brought Chærea up to Athens (*non temerest* 291, 305), then again, where Antipho is introduced, he gives the *σύνδοδος* as the obvious reason. At any rate he ought to have given Parmeno more detailed information about his absence from Piræus.

This Terence has left to *Antipho*, who according to the express testimony of Donatus is the invention of Terence himself. He has introduced him in order to avoid a long soliloquy. This is proved by the rather clumsy way in which the character is dropped². Chærea finds the parents of his friend at home and this fact combined with the fear of meeting some acquaintance of his (which indeed alone would be a sufficient reason) brings him back to the house of Thais. Terence by inventing his perplexed comrade has succeeded in illustrating the mania of the ephebus who runs a long way without thinking of the appointments for the festival. But it does not run without a slight jarring, if v. 541 (*locus, tempus constitutumst*) is compared with v. 608 (*apud libertum Discum*). The whole *σύνδοδος* may perhaps be due to the in-

¹ V. 611 he knows that his father may return from the country at any moment, which does not go too well with his fear of his brother being at home (cp. Braun *Quæstt. Ter.* p. 29).

Cp. Braun 1. 1.

vention of Terence himself, who was thinking of the festival of the young men in the Colax.

Sometimes Terence, eager to condense the Greek original, may have caused some obscurity. Parmeno seems to take great care not to inform Chærea about the actual position of Pamphila, cp. 366, 926 sqq. (meretrix), 952, 985 (fidicina), as if he himself had not heard, though rather incredulously, Thais enlarge upon this matter. V. 1042 Parmeno steps into the house to find Phædria, whose presence at this time he cannot suspect. And where is he the whole time between v. 495 and v. 923? V. 726 Dorias takes the gold into the house — why not v. 628? V. 733 Pythias wonders at Thais leaving the banquet so early, while Dorias might already have informed her of this.

Much of this may be due to the author's activity as an adaptor. It would hardly be suffered in a Greek original.

PA Eitrem, Samson
4247 Observations on the Colax
E57 of Menander

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 15 20 02 12 024 8